

The Word in the Lens of Multy-Paradigm Research (on the Material of Far Related Languages)

Nina M. Korbozerova

Correspondence: Nina M. Korbozerova, Department of Romance Philology, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, 01033, 60 Volodymyrska Str., Kyiv, Ukraine

Received: May 8, 2022

Accepted: November 30, 2022

Online Published: December 17, 2022

doi:10.11114/smc.v10i3.5841

URL: <https://doi.org/10.11114/smc.v10i3.5841>

Abstract

Language performs the most complex communicative function of exchanging thoughts between people. At the same time, it is a self-sufficient, flexible, highly structured, internally self-organising, synergistic system consisting of sounds, words, and sentences. The purpose of the study is to compare words in two languages – Spanish and Ukrainian – at morphological and lexical levels. Using the method of empirical research, comparison, typological and taxonomic comparison, multi-paradigm analysis, the Ukrainian and Spanish languages, which are far related, were compared. Non-related languages are also involved in the analysis, which allows identifying linguistic universals and establishing common features either for all languages or for individual groups of languages. When using multi-paradigm analysis, it is necessary to consider the fact that the verbalisation of the concept by linguistic means and its symbolisation of national identity in the compared languages occurs in different ways due to the specific historical, cultural, and linguistic influence inherent in it, which each ethnic group receives. To eliminate linguistic and cultural barriers between speakers of different linguistic cultures, a multi-level analysis is necessary, in which the leading role belongs to the multi-paradigm and comparative-typological study of linguistic units. There are a lot of languages in the world, the number of which varies according to the principles by which they are classified. Nevertheless, regardless of the accepted principles of classification, a number of languages exhibit some structural similarities, regardless of their genetic relationship, and vice versa, being closely related, languages can detect differences at any level.

Keywords: multi-paradigm analysis, linguistic culture, taxonomy, Ukrainian and Spanish languages, linguistic typology

1. Introduction

Language, as the most important means of human communication, performs the most complex communicative function of exchanging thoughts between people in society. At the same time, it is a self-sufficient, flexible, highly structured, internally self-organising, synergetic system consisting of sounds, words, and sentences. All the languages of the world are grouped based on similarity, which is conditioned upon the commonality of their origin (for example, the Indo-European family). However, the external similarity of signs in two languages can be conditioned by various reasons, which include coincidences, lexical borrowings, and common origin (Tishchenko, 2011). The kinship of languages is established using the comparative historical method (this method is not the subject of analysis in this study) and is manifested by the presence of common features and regular correspondences of their lexical composition, sounds, morphemes, ways of word formation, grammatical forms and categories, and sentence models (Khazretali et al., 2018). In linguistics, it is customary to distinguish the main levels of grouping of languages: a family (e.g., Indo-European), a subfamily (e.g., European), a branch (e.g., Romano-Germanic, Balto-Slavic), a group (e.g., Western Romance, East Slavic), and the language itself (e.g., Spanish, Ukrainian).

The family of languages is a basic language structure, which determines closely related and far related languages that have at least 15% of the matches in the basic list of words. Languages belonging to the same language family, which have a common feature and originate from the same language that was used earlier, are called related (for example, the European subfamily of languages). The concept of a genealogical tree of languages and linguistic divergence follows from this definition. Related languages represent different temporal and spatial variants of the same continuous linguistic tradition. In this case, Spanish and Ukrainian belong to the same language family, or subfamily, and have a common proto-language (e.g., Indo-European family, European subfamily). Within the framework of related languages, subgroups are distinguished, which include the languages closest in origin to closely related ones (for example, Romance languages).

In turn, languages that belong to different groups of the same family are far related languages (e.g., Ukrainian and Spanish). A group of unrelated languages consists of languages that originate from different proto-languages and that belong to different language families, respectively (e.g., Ukrainian and Kazakh or Spanish and Japanese) (Holubovska, 2004; *Classification of the Languages...*, 2022).

The study of various languages on a synchronous cross-section shows that a number of similarities are found between some languages in vocabulary, phonology and grammatical structure, while in another group of languages taken for analysis, on the contrary, differences appear (Podoliak, 2021). On the one hand, for example, in the Ukrainian, Polish, and Czech languages, which belong to the Slavic group of languages, a number of similar linguistic features are clearly traced. Similarly, for example, there are a number of similarities between Spanish, Portuguese, and Italian, which belong to the Romance group of languages. In turn, when comparing these two groups of languages, Slavic and Romance, a number of features of the linguistic plan are revealed, which indicate both coincidences and discrepancies. In this regard, such distinguishing features as the grammatical case of the noun in the Slavic languages are genetically determined, while in the Romance languages, the grammatical case in the name area is completely absent, the function of which was completely assumed by the preposition. To summarise, there are a large number of languages in the world, the number of which varies according to the principles by which they are classified. Nevertheless, regardless of the accepted principles of classification, a number of languages exhibit some structural similarities, regardless of their genetic relationship, and vice versa, being closely related, languages can detect differences at any level (Demchenko et al., 2020).

The purpose of the study is to compare words in two languages – Spanish and Ukrainian – at morphological and lexical levels.

2. The Study of the Name in Closely Related Languages from the Perspective of the Theory of Linguistic Typology

Currently, one of the dominant positions in linguistics is occupied by a special section of language comparison – linguistic typology, which has already accumulated quite a rich research experience, which is based on new methods applied to the study. The main achievement of modern linguistic typology is the development of the doctrine of the types of languages and language structure, which identifies both general patterns of development of languages and their similar lexical, phonological, and grammatical features, and a number of distinguishing features in different groups of related-languages (both closely and far related) and unrelated-languages. It has been repeatedly noted in modern science that common structural features can be found in a wide variety of languages that do not have any genetic relationship. Thus, in the example such as beautiful flower in English, beautiful occupies the preposition to the noun and does not conform grammatically with the noun flower. On this basis, it's possible to include these phrases in one group with a common structural characteristic.

In accordance with this feature, there are other classification categories of languages. For example, Ukrainian and Spanish, which are far related. It can be stated that attributive phrases are characteristic of both compared languages, however, their distinguishing feature is the fact that they are structured in most cases based on the double grammatical agreement in both gender and number. The structural difference between Spanish and Ukrainian attributive phrases is the positional arrangement of the adjective relative to the noun. In Spanish, the definition, as a rule, takes a postposition (un día hermoso), and in Ukrainian – preposition (гарний день). In Spanish, depending on the ending of the adjective, there is a single or double agreement of the attribute with the noun. Thus, the single agreement only in the number is carried out if the Spanish adjective has an ending on the vowel -e (la mujer inteligente / el hombre inteligente). On the contrary, the double agreement of the Spanish attribute in both gender and number is observed if the adjective in the initial position has the attribute ending with a vowel -o (el libro ilustrado / los libros ilustrados, la rosa blanca / las rosas blancas). In the Ukrainian language, in the singular, there is a double agreement of the attribute with the noun (святковий день / цікава розповідь), and in the plural – only the singular (святкові дні / цікаві розповіді).

Therefore, according to this comparative theory, Ukrainian and Spanish could also refer to one typologically similar category of languages in which attributive phrases are constructed according to the type of agreement. Thus, in this perspective of typological research, it becomes possible to repeatedly compare the Spanish and Ukrainian languages on a synchronous cross-section of their development, based on certain principles and approaches to structural classification. Moreover, with this approach to the analysis of linguistic phenomena, both similar and distinctive features should be considered, which are of a general nature and cover a fairly wide range of homogeneous features. Comparing linguistic typology with comparative historical linguistics, cardinal differences between them have been repeatedly noted in the special literature. First of all, this concerns the fact that the first attracts to the analysis for the most part either closely related or unrelated languages, and the second, on the contrary, examines languages that are genetically closely related. Depending on the goals, objectives, object and methods of research, linguistic typology is usually divided into general and private. The first deals with, as the name implies, general problems related to identifying all the similarities and differences that can characterise the system of a particular language, for example, at the phonological level regarding the

system of vowel and consonant phonemes, phoneme groups by rising, voicing, grammatical level regarding the division of words into lexico-grammatical classes, into morphological features of parts of speech, etc. At the lexical level, however, the phenomena of synonymy, antonymy, polysemy, paronymy, etc.

In this case, the study goes beyond related (closely or far related) languages, therefore, non-related languages are also involved in the analysis, which allows identifying linguistic universals and establishing common features either for all languages or for individual groups of languages. In the case of a particular typology, the number of languages for analysing both related (closely or far related) and unrelated languages is limited. At the same time, it is necessary to select any feature for which the study is being conducted. In addition, a particular typology can rely not only on the synchronic method of research, but also use the diachronic method, which opens up the prospect for investigating numerous transitional cases from one structural type to another within a single language, for example, from analyticism to synthetism and vice versa. In this case, the principles of historical typology are also successfully applied. In addition, the range of problems of linguistic typology is expanding by involving territorial features, individual subsystems and language levels in the analysis, which allows considering a single word, part of speech, etc., or, conversely, the morphological or phonological system in general. It is also important to consider the applied nature of linguistic typology, which is designed to correctly describe the main typological phonological, grammatical, and lexical features of the compared languages to avoid mistakes among students when learning a foreign language (Sabatayeva et al., 2018). In this case, the principles of comparative typology of foreign and native languages are put to the fore. The productive direction of linguistic typology at the present time is the typological and taxonomic comparison of languages.

3. Productivity and Principles of Typological and Taxonomic Comparison of Closely Related Languages

At the present stage of the development of linguistics, the emphasis is put on the problem of investigating related (both closely and far related) and unrelated languages in terms of typological and taxonomic comparison of lexical and grammatical subsystems. This approach is dictated by the conditions of broad globalisation, intercultural communication, and interest in learning foreign languages, which pushes researchers to search for new approaches in establishing linguistic facts (Kolyeva et al., 2021; Akanova et al., 2022). In this regard, the most productive research is in the field of taxonomic typology, which allows to systematise and classify lexemes and parts of speech in each of the compared languages to further compare and identify universal and specific characteristics of the content of the nominal taxon in Ukrainian and Spanish.

Taxonomic typology as one of the sections of linguistic typology is a productive component of modern general linguistics (Demchenko et al., 2020). Taxonomy (from Greek – law) is interpreted as a section of the theory of systematisation of complexly organised areas of reality and knowledge that are hierarchically structured (Austin, 2022; Zholaushieva et al., 2022). The main task of taxonomic typology is the development of the vocabulary of this field as a result of the comparison of linguistic facts of both related and unrelated languages. The foundations of a new area in linguistics were laid at the end of the 20th century (Biscub, 2016) and the basis of this method were the principles of natural sciences, primarily biology. The term "taxonomy" as a scientific term in linguistics was borrowed from biology, where it denotes the theory of classification and systematisation of complex systems. It is generally recognised that the taxonomy is represented as a tree consisting of structures of a certain set (Korolyova, 2017). Crowning this whole structure is the so-called apical taxon – name. Below are other taxa characterised by more specific classification features. The base is made up of separate units, also called characteristics. Such a tree seems to be a hierarchical system. At these levels of the hierarchy, various taxa are placed, which are subordinate to only one taxon, which, in turn, is subordinate to the taxon of the highest rank. When conducting the study, it is necessary to consider the fact that taxa are only components of systematics, which is a much broader concept than taxonomy. The difference between them is that systematics deals with a variety of units in their relationships, while taxonomy deals with the principles, methods, and rules of classification of these units.

For conducting taxonomic research in linguistics, it is essential, first of all, the correct definition of ranks as categories (Austin, 2022), which is supported by the procedure of gradation and sequential classification of objects, phenomena, and categories in accordance with specific taxonomic schemes and criteria, namely: signs, semes, structuremes, pragemms, functions and proper subordination of taxa. The latter correspond to certain groups and categories of discrete objects connected by similar characteristics and features. In addition, it is necessary to leave the postulate that the principle of taxonomy is used in linguistics solely for the purpose of ordering lexical, morphological, and syntactic units. The result of a successful study can be considered the creation of a scientifically based multicomponent classification (Tamburelli, 2021). This approach allows considering a taxonomy as one that has direct access to a typology, the basis of which is the structuring of systems of objects and their groupings using a generalised model and typing. In modern linguistics, taxonomic typology occupies an important place in the process of comparing languages, since taxonomic typology allows simultaneously deeply analysing the type of language and the type in the language, and solving the problem of linguistic universals, phenomena of isomorphism and allomorphy in languages using a reference language or without its help. Due to the lack of a unified approach of linguists to the concept of a language type, it is currently quite difficult to interpret

this term.

At the morphological level of language learning, taxonomic typology allows focusing the comparison of languages in a new way in terms of identifying specific features in the system of noun declination and verb conjugation. Particularly interesting is the interpretation of taxonomic typology presented by I. Biscub (2016). Thus, the researcher calls taxonomic typology "How-typology", considering that the classification of languages is done according to specific parameters, among which morphological structure and classifications that confirm the existence of isolating, agglutinative, and flexive models of word structure prevail. When using the method of complex typological comparison of the substantive taxon in Spanish and Ukrainian, it should be assumed that each of the languages is characterised by two main parameters – social and structural, on the one hand, and therefore in society, it has a major functional role in the act of communication. And on the other hand, it has an internally organised rigid structure and simultaneously flexible system of elements at phonological, lexical, morphological, and syntactic levels. Comparison of taxonomic features and the functional load of individual linguistic units serves as a basis for establishing either the degree of kinship or its absence between modern languages, in particular, to identify the degree of similarity/difference of a linguistic phenomenon, its linguistic genotype, and to determine the genetic model by which a particular language is built.

In accordance with the typological classification, which is based on the structural features of languages, ways of combining morphemes, the role of inflexion and affixes in the construction of grammatical forms of a word and in the transmission of its grammatical meaning, the Spanish and Ukrainian languages taken for analysis are referred to the languages of the inflexional system, where inflexion plays a major role and has a stable feature in the morphological structuring of the word. Spanish as a representative of a group of Romance languages and Ukrainian as a representative of a group of Slavic languages are known to belong to different linguistic structural types, although each of them, always showing signs of a specific type, simultaneously manifests diametrically opposite signs. According to the signs of the expression of grammatical meanings, Spanish belongs to the analytical and agglutinative types, and Ukrainian belongs to the synthetic and inflexional types, although both are structured according to the nominative organisation. On the other hand, the elements of analyticism are clearly traced in the Ukrainian language, and the elements of synthetism – in Spanish. Moreover, the grammatical meaning in the languages of the analytical system is formed by a preposition, while in the languages of the synthetic system this meaning is always formed by a change in the word form, and in some cases simultaneously by a change in the word form and preposition. The noun belongs to the class of lexico-grammatical words with specific features in each of the compared languages and is characterised by special typological patterns.

The typological-taxonomic comparison of the substantive taxon in Spanish and Ukrainian manifests a similar pattern in the formation of its grammatical meaning of number and gender in most cases synthetically using affixes and endings in the word form. Thus, the category of the number of a noun expresses the opposition of one object to the multiplicity of the same objects. Using the basic principles of typological and taxonomic comparison in relation to the Spanish and Ukrainian languages, it can be stated that the general way of expressing the grammatical meaning of a number in them is inflexion (*casa / casas* – Spanish, *місто / міста* – Ukrainian). In the morphological structure of the substantive taxon in both languages, both similar and dissimilar signs are also recorded in the system of Singularia and Pluralia Tantum (*los riñones*, pl. – Spanish *нирки*, pl. – Ukrainian, *la leña*, sing. – Spanish *дрова*, pl. – Ukrainian). However, the grammatical gender in both languages does not formally coincide in quantitative terms: in Spanish, there are two forms (masculine and feminine), which correspond to three forms in the Ukrainian language (masculine, feminine, and neuter). The feminine gender of nouns in Spanish and Ukrainian is created by inflexion or inflexion in combination with a suffix (*el chico / la chica* – Spanish, *директор / директорка* – Ukrainian) or by replacing the word form, the so-called suppletive form (*el hombre / la mujer* – Spanish, *син / донька* – Ukrainian). Nouns that are unchangeable in gender and number in Spanish and Ukrainian clearly demonstrate signs of analyticism (*el/los torax* – Spanish in the meaning of *грудна клітина*, Ukrainian word *голова* (feminine or masculine) in the meaning of *director*), because the grammatical meaning, in this case, is expressed within a single word by a minimum number of morphemes.

A specific feature of the Ukrainian language, unlike Spanish, is the grammatical case, according to which the noun changes, with the exception of a small group of unchangeable nouns. In the Ukrainian language, the grammatical case of nouns characterises the type either exclusively synthetic (the presence of only the case), or combined, consisting of both analytical and synthetic types (the presence of a case that is accompanied by a preposition). The latter is a combination of grammatical meaning, which is expressed in the Ukrainian language by inflexion as part of a word form and the locus of a grammatical morpheme, and is formalised by the preposition (e.g., *за селом*). On the contrary, in Spanish, case relations that are absent explicitly are always expressed implicitly at a deep semantic level and are structured only by a preposition (e.g., *fuera de la región*). Thus, it can be argued that a thorough understanding of the nature of taxonomic typology and its use in comparing Spanish and Ukrainian linguistic facts allows: first, a versatile linguistic analysis at any level, and, second, to find different shades in the structural, semantic, and functional characteristics of a particular linguistic phenomenon in terms of its comparison.

4. Linguocultural Concept and Its Translation as Basic Operators of Multi-Paradigm Analysis

Modern linguistic studies testify to the trend towards the conceptualisation of research, which is achieved through the use of multi-level multi-paradigm analysis based on linguocognitive, linguoculturological, comparative typological, translation, linguoconflictological, both synchronic and diachronic approaches to the study of linguistic units in an inseparable unity. The method of multi-paradigm analysis conditionally assumes three stages of research: conceptual, linguistic, and psycholinguistic (Terekhova, 2016; 2018). Cultural studies correlate with cognitive ideas that language reflects a certain worldview, the perception of the people, which is formed as a result of the creative cognitive activity of people. Having undergone partial changes under the influence of historical events, cultural concepts retain their traditional form and significance in the language throughout the existence of a particular linguistic and cultural community (Baikushikova, 2019). The interpretation of the linguocultural concept given by I.O. Holubovska (2004) as a peculiar gene, which enters into the genotype of culture as a mental fact of cultural space, as a maximally abstracted idea of a cultural object, and as a concentrated expression of spiritual and emotional experience of a certain ethnos. It follows from this that it is advisable to consider six main parameters as components of a linguistic concept: historical, etymological, conceptual, associative, figurative, and value (Skobnikova, 2018; Beshley, 2015). The fundamental premise, in this case, is the fact that the linguocultural concept is a cultural gene (Harbera, 2020), and the language itself is the "spirit" of the people (Myronova, 2019).

The expansion of the practice of intercultural communication and the increase in the amount of information in a foreign language has led to the need to conduct, first of all, linguoculturological and comparative-typological studies of various languages, aimed at identifying isomorphic and allomorphic features, national specifics of language categories, and to describe the mechanism of effective intercultural interaction. The study of typological features of Ukrainian and foreign languages, the establishment of lexical and grammatical correspondences between them, in turn, is the linguistic basis of translation theory, which in total plays an important role in overcoming linguistic barriers and in the implementation of successful communication between representatives of different linguistic cultures. In this regard, there is a need for a thorough study of the causes of linguistic and cultural barriers, or language barriers, in the process of communication, which is closely related to the problems of linguoculturology as an integral part of the linguistic multi-paradigm. The emergence of linguistic and cultural barriers that complicate the process of communication and successful exchange of information between people belonging to different linguistic cultures is conditioned by many factors, among which the defining problems are linguistic and extralinguistic (Aitymova et al., 2022). Moreover, linguistic factors, as is known, are closely related to the peculiarities of the grammatical and lexical structure of languages, the semantics of linguistic units, while extralinguistic factors are closely related to the specifics of cultural norms, traditions, mentality, and spiritual values of the people.

The reasons for barriers to communication are conditioned by three main factors. Firstly, the linguistic signs used to structure the utterance may differ in their semantic scope in different languages. Secondly, the way of generalising new information presented in one language may not coincide with the same way that exists in another linguistic culture when nominating the same situation. Thirdly, the basis for generalising a fragment of reality in different linguistic cultures may be different. Barriers become obvious in a conflict collision in the process of comparing native culture with a foreign one. Their occurrence in cross-cultural communication is explained both by the different degrees of semantic volume of language signs in different languages, and by the different ways of generalising information. The linguistic competence and knowledge of the cultural foundation, informing about the mentality, traditions, cultural norms, norms of behaviour and spiritual values of the people, all this, on the contrary, generate successful intercultural communication and, as a result, an adequate translation process, which plays an important role in the comparative typological study of linguistic units (Shaporeva et al., 2022). In a situation of contact between representatives of different cultures, the barrier should not be an obstacle to mutual understanding. The process of intercultural communication is significantly complicated due to the peculiarities of the cultures to which the communication participants belong.

In intercultural communication, linguistic competence as possession of an abstract system of norms is a necessary condition for its effectiveness, which is used as a means of communication. The participants of the dialogue should not only possess communicative competence, i.e., the ability to use language tools in specific social situations, but also the cognitive ability to produce thoughts in a foreign language, or in the language of communication. The greatest interest in terms of comparison and translation is caused by the analysis of linguistic units of the Spanish and Ukrainian languages at the lexical level in terms of their semantic structure, derivation, and conversion, the formation of phrases, and ways of borrowing them. In this context, it is important to investigate the linguocultural concept as a complex verbalised mental education that includes knowledge about the system of cultural, historical, spiritual, and moral values of a particular people (Synhayivska, 2016; Redkovska & Grabovska, 2018). Structure, integrity, and constant dynamism allow one linguistic and cultural concept to enter into various contacts with other concepts and form more complex system units. Thus, a striking example can be Spanish anthroponyms, toponyms, proverbs, sayings and phraseological phrases in

comparison with Ukrainian ones: Pan por pan, vino por vino / Зуб за зуб, око за око. These examples clearly show the relationship between linguistic and cultural elements, for example, pan, vino / зуб, око.

The linguistic and cultural concept is characterised by historical variability conditioned by the constant changes that occur in its prototype core, for example, the Spanish word castillo, through a long process of derivation and metaphorisation, acquires a new meaning that turns into a symbol of the national identity of Spaniards, namely, the name of a part of the country of Spain – Castilla. Unlike the Spanish language, the Ukrainian lexeme замок does not have such a range of characteristics that historically could lead to the symbolisation of the national identity of Ukrainians.

5. Conclusions

Summing up, it can be stated that when using poly-paradigm analysis, it is necessary to consider the fact that the verbalisation of the concept by linguistic means and its symbolisation of national identity in the compared languages occurs in different ways due to the specific historical, cultural, and linguistic influence inherent in it, which each ethnic group receives. To eliminate linguistic and cultural barriers between speakers of different linguistic cultures, a multi-level analysis is necessary, in which the leading role belongs to the multi-paradigmatic and comparative-typological study of linguistic units. In addition, the range of problems of linguistic typology is expanding by involving territorial features, individual subsystems and language levels in the analysis, which allows considering a single word, part of speech, etc., or, conversely, the morphological or phonological system in general.

Thus, it can be argued that a thorough understanding of the nature of taxonomic typology and its use in comparing Spanish and Ukrainian linguistic facts allows: first, a versatile linguistic analysis at any level, and, second, to find different shades in the structural, semantic, and functional characteristics of a particular linguistic phenomenon in terms of its comparison. It is known that the historical memory of the people, national values, tastes, interests, beliefs, traditions, and self-image are components of the national consciousness of any ethnic group. They are also characteristic of the self-consciousness of both the Spanish and Ukrainian people. However, the verbalisation of the same concept by linguistic means in each of the abovementioned languages is carried out in different ways, since in this aspect of historical, cultural, and linguistic influence that one or another ethnic group receives.

References

- Aitymova, A., Shaporeva, A., Kopnova, O., Kushumbayev, A., & Aitymov, Z. (2022). Development and modeling of combined components of the information environment. *Eastern-European Journal of Enterprise Technologies*, 2(2-116), 51-60. <https://doi.org/10.15587/1729-4061.2022.255084>
- Akanova, A., Ospanova, N., Sharipova, S., Mauina, G., & Abdugulova, Z. (2022). Development of a thematic and neural network model for data learning. *Eastern-European Journal of Enterprise Technologies*, 4(2-118), 40-50.
- Austin, P. (2022). Theory of Language: A Taxonomy. *SN Social Sciences*, 1(78), 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-021-00085-x>
- Baikushikova, G. (2019). New attraction-centres of educational migration in Eurasia. In: *Cross-Border Exchanges: Eurasian perspectives on logistics and diplomacy* (pp. 217–226). Bruxelles: Peter Lang Verlag.
- Beshley, O. V. (2015). Linguocultural concept YOUTH: structure and methods of research. *Scientific Bulletin of the International Humanities University. Series: Philology*, 9(1), 18-20.
- Biscub, I. (2016). Linguistic and Cognitive Categorisation. *Current Issues of Foreign Philology*, 4, 14-21.
- Classification of the Languages. Geneological Classification of Languages. (2022). Retrieved from <https://encyclopedia2.thefreedictionary.com/Geneological+Classification+of+Languages>
- Demchenko, N., Krekhno, T., & Chala, A. (2020). *General Linguistics*. Kharkiv: Kharkiv Humanitarian and Pedagogical Academy.
- Harbera, I. (2020). Linguo-cultural concept of HUMAN. In: M. M. Vorobel et al. (Eds.), *Collective monograph: Representation of educational achievements, mass media and the role of philology in the modern system of sciences* (pp. 38–42). Vinnytsia: Yevropeyska Naukova Platforma.
- Holubovska, I. O. (2004). *Ethnic Features of Linguistic Pictures of the World*. Kyiv: Logos.
- Khazretali, T., Amantai, Y., Mustafa, G., Nurlan, O., & Berkimbaev, K. (2018). Kazakh-Turkish cultural relationship of the 20th century: Through a scientific biography and the works of Shakarim kudaiberdyuly. *Astra Salvensis*, 6(1), 209-222.
- Kolyeva, N., Kopnova, O., & Shaporeva, A. (2021). Adaptation Information and analytical system adaptation in the

- contour of the corporate system of the university. *E3S Web of Conferences*, 270, 01037. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202127001037>
- Korolyova, V. V. (2017). Taxonomy of discourses in modern linguistic studies. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 1, 206-214.
- Myronova, N. V. (2019). Linguocultural code: theoretical basis of research. *Problems of Semantics, Pragmatics and Cognitive Linguistics*, 35, 13-25. <https://doi.org/10.17721/2663-6530.2019.35.01>
- Podoliak, M. (2021). Unconscious memory in acquiring new vocabulary using flashcards. *East European Journal of Psycholinguistics*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.29038/ejpl.2021.8.2.pod>
- Redkovska, T. O., & Grabovska, N. B. (2018). Verbalization of ethnocultural component in lexicon of Spanish language. *Problems of Semantics, Pragmatics and Cognitive Linguistics*, 33, 100-110. <https://doi.org/10.17721/2663-6530.2018.33.07>
- Sabatayeva, B., Saduov, A., Madiyarova, E., Jempeissova, G., Selezneva, I., Shtiller, M., & Fursova, T. (2018). International students' satisfaction with university services: The case of postgraduate students from central Asia. *Espacios*, 39(9), 04.
- Shaporeva, A., Kopnova, O., Shmigirilova, I., Kukhareenko, Y., & Aitymova, A. (2022). Development of comprehensive decision support tools in distance learning quality management processes. *Eastern-European Journal of Enterprise Technologies*, 4(3-118), 43-50. <https://doi.org/10.15587/1729-4061.2022.263285>
- Skobnikova, O. V. (2018). Methods of analysis of the linguistic and cultural concept (on the example of the FAMILY concept). *Bulletin of the Mariupol State University. Series: Philology*, 18, 286-293.
- Synhayivska, G. V. (2016). Connotative aspects of semantics of anthroponyms in Spanish proverbs. *Problems of Semantics, Pragmatics and Cognitive Linguistics*, 29, 209-227.
- Tamburelli, M. (2021). Taking taxonomy seriously in linguistics. *Lingua*, 256, 103068. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2021.103068>
- Terekhova, S. I. (2016). Theoretical and methodological fundamentals of contrastive multy-paradigm analyses of reference representations (based on the Ukrainian, Russian and English languages). *Problems of Semantics, Pragmatics and Cognitive Linguistics*, 29, 227-264.
- Terekhova, S. I. (2018). Multy-paradigmality as a basis of modern linguistic studies of communication coordinates representations. *Problems of Semantics, Pragmatics and Cognitive Linguistics*, 33, 21-37. <https://doi.org/10.17721/2663-6530.2018.33.02>
- Tishchenko, K. M. (2011). *Indo-European Community*. Kyiv: Institute of Encyclopedic Research of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.
- Zholaushievna, N. G., Abdrakhmanov, R., Adylbekova, E., & Danebekkyzy, K. G. (2022). Applying augmented and virtual reality in online and offline educaion. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology*, 100(8), 2528-2541.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution license](#) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.